DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 980 JC 980 055

AUTHOR	O'Banion, Terry
TITLE	Creating More Learning-Centered Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	League for Innovation in the Community Coll.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Information; Change Strategies; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Cooperative Learning; *Educational Change; Educational Development; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Educational Strategies; Faculty College Relationship; *Learner Controlled Instruction; Learning Modules; Learning Strategies; Staff Role; *Student Centered Curriculum; *Student Role; *Teacher Role; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Learner Centered Instruction

ABSTRACT

Efforts by community colleges to become more learning-centered reflect the reforms taking place in traditional higher education. In addition to making learning the highest priority, American education must continue to overhaul its outdated, traditional framework restricted by time, place, bureaucracy, and limited teacher roles. The ideal model of education, the learning college, should inspire substantive change in individual learners, endow them with responsibility for their education, offer as many learning options as possible, assist in collaborative learning activities, define the roles of learning facilitators by the needs of the learners, and record improved and expanded learning. To achieve this ideal, six community colleges created the following goals: to recast mission statements to focus on learning, realign current structures to foster teamwork, involve all stakeholders in the educational process, and develop an open system of communication. Key issues and obstacles in becoming more learning-centered include funding, recognizing a collective need for change, and collaborating to achieve a common goal. Meeting these challenges, as well as linking every action with learning and evaluating the outcomes, are the first steps in becoming a learning-centered institution. (Contains 43 references.) (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 414 980

Creating More Learning-Centered Community Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Terry O'Banion

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Doucette
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

League for Innovation in the Community College
PeopleSoft, Inc.

1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 980 055

The League for Innovation in the Community College is indebted to PeopleSoft, Inc., one of the League's key corporate partners, for its support of this monograph distributed as part of the League's Learning Initiative. A description of the services and products PeopleSoft, Inc. provides for community colleges can be found on the inside back cover.

Creating More Learning-Centered Community Colleges

Terry O'Banion

This monograph is based in part on two previous publications by the author. *A Learning College for the 21st Century*, 1997, was published by Oryx Press for the American Council on Education and the American Association of Community Colleges. The book may be ordered from Oryx Press by calling 1-800-279-6799. All royalties have been donated to the American Association of Community Colleges. *The Learning Revolution: A Guide for Community College Trustees*, 1997, was published by the Association of Community College Trustees as a Special Issue of the *Trustee Quarterly*.

Creating More Learning-Centered Community Colleges

Table Of Contents

Acknowledgments 5

Introduction 7

Placing Learning First 9

Overhauling the Traditional Architecture of Education 11

The Learning College 15

Six Colleges Take Their First Steps 21

Key Issues and Challenges 25

Epilogue 33

References 35

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph was prepared as a guide for community college faculty, administrators, and support staff committed to leading their institutions to a more learning-centered perspective. Since I wanted this is to be a truly useful document, I asked a number of colleagues in the community college to critique it for me. A total of 26 community college faculty members and administrators from Florida, Oregon, Arizona, California, and Missouri critiqued the monograph. In addition, ten members of the League for Innovation's Executive Leadership Institute, representing eight additional states and Canada, shared their critiques.

The critiques ranged from positive endorsements to statements noting that the reader was greatly offended. Reviewing the critiques and engaging several of the reviewers in follow-up conversations by telephone has been a substantive learning experience for me. As a result of this experience, I have either freshly confirmed or learned anew that:

- It is exceedingly difficult to generalize about "community colleges," as this common grouping belies their complexity and unique features.
- Community college faculty members and administrators care deeply about the community college as an idea and about their own individual institutions; and they care deeply about their students.
- Calls for substantive change elicit complex responses, sometimes regarding the specific issues under discussion, sometimes as an opportunity to grind old axes.

In any case, I am deeply indebted to the following reviewers for helping me to prepare this monograph, which is a far cry from the one they read originally:

- Patrick Nellis, Valencia Community College (Florida)
- Dennis Gilbert, Lane Community College (Oregon)
- Laurence Victor, Pima Community College (Arizona)
- Don Doucette, Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri) and a group of selected faculty and administrators. I am especially grateful to Don Doucette for his reworking of the section on "Funding Learning."
- Don Berz, Chaffey College (California) and the following members of Chaffey's Focus on Learning Task Force: Louise Agos, Mike Alexander, Michael Dinielli, Vera Dunwoody, Priscilla Fernandez, Myra Harada, Laura Hope, Wayne Hubert, Catherine Keenan, Reneé Ketchum, Kipp Preble, Bill Purkiss, and Muriel Zimmermann.
- Selected members of the League for Innovation's Executive Leadership Institute, Class of 1997.

With the revisions made with assistance from these colleagues, I hope this monograph will be useful as a catalyst to encourage thoughtful and richer conversations about how community colleges can become more learning-centered institutions.

Terry O'Banion
Newport Beach, California

INTRODUCTION

A dip into the literature on American education at any point in this century will reveal a reform movement either flourishing in full bloom or in the early stages of emergence or decline. The impulse to improve, perhaps basic to human nature, flowers again and again in education as we refine past efforts and experiment with new practices in our continuing quest for quality.

Throughout the 1980s, secondary and elementary schools struggled with one of the most massive reform movements in the history of education. Triggered by the 1983 publication of *A Nation At Risk* that lambasted the "rising tide of mediocrity" in the nation's schools, a wave of educational reform swept the country. Over 100 national reports and 300 state reports fueled a number of key changes: increased requirements for high school graduation, increased standards for teacher's certification, increased use of assessment, and increased application of technology. These changes, however, did not bring about the desired results of their champions, and some critics (Daggett 1992, Leonard 1992, and Marchese 1995) observed that after ten years of such reform the nation's schools were no better than at the beginning of the decade.

For the most part, institutions of higher education were largely unaffected by reform efforts in the public schools. Colleges and universities studied these reform efforts, and some assisted public schools in carrying out reforms. The policies, programs, and practices in higher education, however, were left intact until the early 1990s when the impulse to improve surfaced in a number of reform reports directed at higher education.

In 1993, *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education*, published as "An Open Letter to Those Concerned About the American Future," triggered a wave of reform in higher education similar to that of the public schools in the 1980s. In fact, the 1993 report echoed similar alarms sounded in the 1983 report:

> A disturbing and dangerous mismatch exists between what American society needs of higher education and what it is receiving. Nowhere is the mismatch more dangerous than in the quality of undergraduate preparation provided on many campuses. The American imperative for the twenty-first century is that society must hold higher education to much higher expectations or risk national decline (Wingspread Group on Higher Education, p. 1).

The 1983 and 1993 reports were remarkably similar in their language and in their analysis of the issues. Both reports were issued as "Open Letters" to the public; both reports indicated that the current system of education was inappropriate for the complexity of American society; both reports cited extensive data on the failures of students; both reports sounded the alarm as an "imperative" for a society at "great risk."

But in their recommendations for solutions, the reports were vastly different. For the public schools, the 1983 report recommended shoring-up the current system by increasing standards, revising curricula, adding technology, and increasing spending. For higher education, the 1993 report recommended what many have come to view as a radical departure from past solutions: place learning first and change the historical architecture of education. The 1993 report stated the challenge in succinct terms: "putting learning at the heart of the academic enterprise will mean overhauling the conceptual, procedural, curricular, and other architecture of postsecondary education on most campuses" (Wingspread Group on Higher Education, p. 14).

In the last few years, the reform movement in higher education, triggered by the 1993 report, *An American Imperative*, has spread rapidly and has captured the attention of legislators, national higher education organizations, and a growing number of faculty members and administrators. Some view the reform movement as a learning revolution (*Business Week* 1994, *Time* 1995, Oblinger and Rush 1997), and others view it as a shift in paradigms (Boggs 1993, Gales 1994, Barr and Tagg 1995). Peter Drucker (1992) believes that

these changes in education reflect a profound shift in the larger society.

> Every few hundred years throughout Western history, a sharp transformation has occurred. In a matter of decades, society altogether rearranges itself–its world view, its basic values, its social and political structures, its arts, its key institutions. Fifty years later a new world exists...our age is such a period of transformation *Managing for the Future*, p. 95).

Drucker goes on to say that "it is a safe prediction that in the next 50 years schools and universities will change more and more drastically than they have since they assumed their present form 300 years ago when they organized themselves around the printed book" (p. 97).

Regardless of how this reform movement in higher education is described–a revolution in learning, a paradigm shift, a societal transformation–the current impulse to improve what we do in education presents a special challenge and opportunity for community colleges. Community colleges resonate well with the goals of the current reform movement: 1) placing learning first, and 2) overhauling the traditional architecture of education. This monograph addresses the role of the community college in relationship to these two goals, provides basic principles for an idealized institution described as the "learning college," shares practical experiences from a number of community colleges actively engaged in becoming more learning-centered institutions, and reviews briefly some of the key issues and challenges community colleges will face if they decide to take the journey.

PLACING LEARNING FIRST

One of the two key goals of the current reform effort calls for institutions of higher education to place learning as their highest priority. Many educators are offended by this recommendation because they believe they have always placed learning first. Of course educators at all levels place great value on learning, but institutional statements and reward systems often reflect other priorities.

Any student of education can cite the three primary missions most often articulated by universities: teaching, research, and service. However, in many universities, the reward system places higher value on research over teaching and service. "Learning" is seldom, if ever, included as one of the primary missions although its relationship to teaching, research, and service is clearly implied by most educators.

Teaching is probably the most universally acclaimed mission for all levels of higher education. In the most comprehensive survey of its kind (Higher Education Research Institute 1991), involving more than 35,000 faculty members in 392 public institutions of higher education, 99 percent of the community college faculty said they considered "being a good teacher" an essential or very important professional goal; so did 98 percent of the faculty from four-year colleges and 98 percent of the faculty from universities.

In the community college such strong value is placed on teaching that the institution is often referred to as "the teaching college." One of the most significant documents ever written on the community college, *Building Communities* (1988)–the report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges–highlighted over and over the central value placed on teaching in the community college: "Building communities through dedicated teaching is the vision and the inspiration of this report" (p. 8). "Quality instruction should be the hallmark of the movement" (p. 25). "The community college should be the nation's premier teaching institution" (p. 25).

The current reform effort does not ask institutions to place less value on teaching or other missions, but to review their statements and reward systems to ensure that learning is valued as visibly as teaching and other missions. In Barr's 1994 study of California community college mission statements, he noted, "It is revealing that virtually every mission statement contained in the catalogs in California's 107 community colleges fails to use the word 'learning' in a statement of purpose" (p. 2).

For community colleges that want to become more learning-centered institutions, it may make a difference in policies, programs, and practices if learning is embedded in institutional culture as the highest priority. Community colleges that wish to embed this perspective in their culture can ask two basic questions that will keep faculty, staff, trustees, and administrators focused on the major goal: 1) Does this action improve and expand learning? and 2) How do we know this action improves and expands learning? These two questions can be applied to any area of activity in an institution to help its members become more aware of the importance of learning in everyday practice:

Does this budget improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does this staff development program improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does the purchase of these six computers improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does the remodeling of this laboratory improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does the creation of this new program improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does this service to the community improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does this faculty evaluation system improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Does this system of shared governance improve and expand learning? How do we know?

Precise answers to these questions and hundreds of similar questions about every institutional action (department, division, board, etc.) will be hard to come by, but the very voicing of these questions is an expression of commitment

and value that will keep the transcendent goal of becoming a more learning-centered institution clearly and constantly visible for all to see.

Overhauling The Traditional Architecture Of Education

The "Carnegie unit" is a metaphor for a vast array of traditional structural elements that have provided the framework for American schooling for generations of students–a framework targeted for major overhaul as the second goal of the current reform effort. The "Carnegie unit" is equivalent to one credit students receive for a yearlong course in high school, an early attempt to measure accumulated learning in order to communicate the amount of learning received. Ideally, students earn five credits in each of four years of high school, and an accumulated 20 credits qualifies them for a high school diploma.

The "Carnegie unit" is but the tip of a very large iceberg that has frozen education into a structure created for an earlier social order. The current architecture of education was created at the end of the last century when 90 percent of the population left school after the eighth grade and when the industrial revolution began to replace an economy built on agriculture. In an agricultural society, students were needed by their families to work on the farms. Schools were designed to end in the middle of the afternoon so that students could be home before dark to milk the cows, gather the eggs, and feed the hogs. Summers were set aside for major farm chores: harvesting crops, tilling new land, building barns, and repairing tools and fences. In Plant City, Florida, a major strawberry-producing center, the schools, as late as the 1940s, were referred to as "strawberry schools" in recognition of their adaptation to an agricultural economy. "Everyone recognizes it [the academic calendar] for what it is: a relic of an agrarian society in which all able-bodied men and women were needed in the fields at certain times of the year" (Lovett 1995, p. B1).

When the nation changed from an agricultural to an industrial economy, the old school structure remained but was updated and streamlined to fit the new industrial model. Scientific management and hierarchical organization, the bedrock principles of bureaucracy, were introduced in the schools, in part to socialize youth in the virtues of order and discipline. More importantly, the modern factory, pioneered by Henry Ford in the production of automobiles, appeared ideally suited to schooling that up to this point had flourished in the cottage industry of one-room schoolhouses. Using the industrial model, schools could be operated like factories with students as products moving through an assembly line. Teachers were the workers who turned out the products, and they were supervised by principals and presidents, the management bureaucracy.

Reformers have been consistent in their criticism of the constraints on learning reflected in the industrial model of schooling. John Dewey said, "Nature has not adapted the young animal to the narrow desk, the crowded curriculum, the silent absorption of complicated facts" (Dewey and Dewey 1962, p. 15). K. Patricia Cross, a leading advocate for educational reform throughout her career, observed over twenty years ago, "After some two decades of trying to find answers to the question of how to provide education for all the people, I have concluded that our commitment to the lock-step, time-defined structures of education stands in the way of lasting progress" (1976, p. 171). More recently, the Tofflers have noted that "America's schools . . . still operate like factories, subjecting the raw material (children) to standardized instruction and routine inspection" (1995, p. 13).

Today this inherited architecture of education places great limits on a system struggling to redefine itself. The school system, from kindergarten through graduate school, is time-bound, place-bound, bureaucracy-bound, and role-bound. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1

Traditional Limits on Education	
Time-Bound	**Place-Bound**
• class hours	• campus
• semester course	• classroom
• school year	• library
Bureaucracy-Bound	**Role-Bound**
• linear/sequential	• expert
• ADA/FTE	• lecture
• credit/grade	• sole judge

Time-Bound

"Hurry up, the bell's going to ring!" Every teacher who has ever lived knows full well the tyranny of time forced on the system by the creation of the "class hour." "Unyielding and relentless, the time available in a uniform six-hour day and a 180-day year is the unacknowledged design flaw in American education. By relying on time as the metric for school organization and curriculum, we have built the learning enterprise on a foundation of sand" (National Education Commission on Time and Learning 1994, p. 8).

Herding groups of students through one-hour sessions five days a week in high schools and three days a week in college flies in the face of everything known about how learning occurs. No one believes that thirty different students arrive at the appointed hour ready to learn in the same way, on the same schedule, all in rhythm with each other.

Recognizing that schools suffer from a time-bound mentality, the United States Department of Education appointed a national commission in 1992 to study the issue. Members of the commission concluded, "Learning in America is a prisoner of time. For the past 150 years, American public schools have held time constant and let learning vary. . . Time is learning's warden" (*Ibid.*, p. 7).

The time framework is particularly pernicious when it is extended to credit hours per course. "The vast majority of college courses have three or four hours of credit. Isn't it a coincidence of cosmic proportions that it takes exactly the same billable unit of work to learn the plays of Shakespeare and differential calculus? Or maybe the guest has been amputated to fit the bed" (Peters 1994, p. 23). The National Education Commission on Time and Learning reports that no matter how complex or simple the school subject–literature, shop, physics, gym, or algebra–the schedule assigns each an impartial national average of 51 minutes per class period, no matter how well or poorly students comprehend the material (1994, p. 7).

The reliance on time as a unit of measure must be changed to reflect mastery instead of time on task, recognizing what is universally understood: human beings learn at different rates. Students should not have to serve time. Time should serve them.

Place-Bound

School is a place. It is a schoolhouse, a schoolroom, a campus, a college. Sometimes school occurs *off-campus* but obviously is defined in relationship to *campus*. Young students go *to school*. Young adults go *off to college*. Incorrigible students are kicked *out of school*. School/college, and the learning that occurs in that context, is *over there*. It is external to everything else that goes on in the learner and the society. It is cloistered, private, sacrosanct territory. Speed zones control its outer edges and liquor stores cannot be built within its perimeters. School is an ivory tower on the hill; it nestles in the gated groves of academe. Its residents do not mix with "townies." School is a place.

School as a place is deeply embedded in the collective unconscious of a people who made great sacrifices to construct their first college in 1636. This early pattern of school and schoolrooms has been stamped indelibly on each successive generation as the natural order of the world of education. " . . .[T]he design and practices of our childhood schoolrooms tend to be reproduced in most education and training settings, even those that aspire to be nontraditional or 'radically innovative.' Despite decades of experience with models, demonstrations, and experimental programs, the "New American School" persistently gravitates back to our familiar models of school, classrooms, and teaching" (Perelman 1992, p. 125).

Schools are as place-bound as they are time-bound, and together these two traditions constitute a formidable barrier to change. Leonard says, ". . .[T]he conventional classroom . . . is the isolation cell, the lock-up" (1992, p. 28). If the student is to be freed for more powerful learning experiences and the teacher is to be freed to facilitate that learning in a more powerful way, then the walls must crumble, the boundaries made limitless. "The metaphor of a classroom is a powerful one. This most basic and fundamental unit of academic life–the sanctity of the classroom and the authority of the teacher within it–is about to be turned inside out" (Plater 1995, p. 27).

. If reform efforts are successful, the campus, the classroom, and the library may no longer serve as the primary sites for learning. There will always be a need for these sites to accommodate some students who learn well in a place-bound context. But in many locations these place-bound constructs will become artifacts abandoned by a great many students and faculty who will embrace the open architecture created by applications of new technology and new knowledge about how human beings learn.

Bureaucracy-Bound

The adoption of business values and practices in education started in about 1900. The great business barons of the time, including Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and J.P. Morgan, powerfully influenced American culture, especially education. President Calvin Coolidge reflected the values of these industrial barons and much of the country when he said, in 1925, "The business of America is business."

Of all the traditional architectural elements of schools, critics have been most vocal about the negative influence of the bureaucratic model. Perelman writes, "Education developed in scale and bureaucratic density to mimic the industrial bureaucracy it was styled to serve. Education in its less than two-century-old modern form is an institution of bureaucracy, by bureaucracy, for bureaucracy" (1992, p. 118-119). Perelman believes that the bureaucratic nature of schools will lead to their ultimate downfall as society in general moves to less bureaucratic models of social interaction. ". . .[T]he disappearance of education is inevitable, not only because education itself has become a huge socialist bureaucracy, but because it is a bureaucracy designed for a bureaucratic society" (*Ibid.*, p. 119).

Leonard makes much the same observation, "From the beginning it was an administrative expediency, an attempt to adapt the tutor-learner system to mass education, a crude way of handling a large number of learners with a much smaller number of teachers. We were able to get away with it in the past chiefly because our society required few academically or technically educated citizens" (1992, p. 26).

Sizer noted a decade ago that the hierarchical bureaucracies of contemporary schools are, ". . . paralyzing American education. The structure is getting in the way of children's learning" (1984, p. 206). And Drucker weighs in with the astute observation that, "Nothing is less productive than to make more efficient what should not be done at all" (1992, p. 29).

The negative effects of the bureaucracy-bound model can be seen in clear relief in the educational code that regulates the California community college system. For 100 years, state and federal laws and structures have been added piece-meal to regulate the delivery of education to California residents; the cumulative effect is mind-boggling. In the California Education Code alone, there are currently over 1,200 statutes that directly regulate and affect the affairs of community colleges. This ponderous code does not even include the 640 regulations adopted by the board of governors and the hundreds and hundreds of federal statutes and regulations that govern the specific activities of colleges. (Nussbaum 1992). Roger Moe, majority leader of the Minnesota State Senate, frustrated in his attempts to bring about educational reform in his state, summed up the basic character of the bureaucratic model: "Higher education is a thousand years of tradition wrapped in a hundred years of bureaucracy" (1994, p. 1).

Role-Bound

By the end of the sixth grade a typical student has experienced at least six different teachers. With high school graduation, assuming six teachers a year for six years, the number climbs to 42. With a bachelor's degree, assuming 124 units divided by 3, the number of teachers for a typical student now totals 83. Ten courses for a master's degree–the minimum level of school achievement for the great majority of instructors working in community colleges today–bring the total number of teachers experienced by a student to 93, not including a vast array of teachers encountered in preschool, scouts, 4-H, Sunday school, summer camp, etc. In short, most educators with a master's degree have spent at least 17 school years under the tutelage of approximately 93 different teachers.

Teaching, however, is the one profession that

expects so much of its members and pays so little. Teachers are expected to be knowledge experts, assessors, evaluators, managers, data collectors, artists, group facilitators, counselors, information processors, lecturers, problem analysts, problem solvers, coaches, mentors, behavior controllers, and value clarifiers. Their formal education is ill designed to prepare them for these multiple roles, and postal clerks and cabin personnel on airlines often receive more on-the-job training. Most new teachers are not inducted into the profession, except sometimes in an internship as part of preteaching exercises. Teachers are thrown into the profession, dumped into the classroom to sink or swim on their own. No wonder they fall back on the models they know too well. They teach as they were taught by the 93 teachers who were their models, repeating the catechism that is passed on generation after generation, bound in a role that pretends each is an up-to-date expert in some discipline, that endorses the lecture method as the primary tool of teaching, and that demands each teacher serve as sole judge and jury over the lives of his or her students.

As Kipp has said: "Having observed people teach all our lives, professors-to-be are supposed to know instinctively what to do in the classroom. We're tossed in this rolling sea with no Baywatch lifeguard around, left to sink or swim among the circling students. Small wonder, then, that the worst practices of the profession get passed along from one generation of professors to the next" (1997 p. 11).

Just as schools must be released from the architectural limits of time and place, teachers must be released from their traditional roles to focus their talents and abilities on the learner and learning as their *raison d'être*. "Restructuring the role of faculty members will, at first, prove to be a monumental undertaking. All of the incentives seem against doing so–except, in the end, survival" (Guskin 1994, p. 16).

Perelman describes the basic model of education in vivid terms: "There may be no more common and erroneous stereotype than the image of instruction as injecting knowledge into an empty head. Whether in a typical schoolroom, or a congressional hearing, or a corporate training session, the same one-way process is acted out. In each, the teacher or expert faces the learners, taking on the critical role of 'fountain of knowledge.' The learner plays the 'receiver of wisdom,' passively accepting the intelligence being dispensed, like an empty bowl into which water is poured" (1992, p. 135). More succinctly, Russell Edgerton (1997), after serving for twenty years as president of the American Association for Higher Education, said, "Professors impart knowledge. Students absorb this knowledge. Examinations test whether students can recall what they have learned. In short, teaching is telling; learning is recalling" (p. 30).

If the dominant role for teachers has been that of conveyor of information, the conveyor belt has been the lecture. "Lecturing is the overwhelming method of choice for teaching undergraduates in most institutions" (Terenzini and Pascarella 1994, p. 29). Despite a large body of evidence gathered over many years regarding the limitations of the lecture method, the current educational architecture supports and encourages its continuing and widespread use. One study (Pollio 1984), for example, found that teachers in the typical classroom spent about 80 percent of their time lecturing to students who were attentive to what was being said about 50 percent of the time.

The historical architecture of education–the time-bound, place-bound, bureaucracy-bound, and role-bound model currently embedded in educational culture–presents a formidable barrier to education reform. Many faculty, administrators, and support staff succeeded as students in this environment, and many work comfortably today within these structures. Furthermore, funding systems, work schedules, and social structures support the continuity of the current architecture. For institutions that want to become more learning-centered, however, the architecture must be changed or there will be significant limits on the extent to which learning can be placed first.

14

THE LEARNING COLLEGE

In major reform efforts it is helpful to review both ideal models of proposed alternatives and the experiences of vanguard institutions that are beginning to create their own models. In this section we review the idealized model; in the next section we review the practical experiences of six colleges that are on their way to becoming more learning-centered institutions.

Community colleges will launch the reform efforts to become more learning-centered from a variety of positions. Some will extend their current efforts in Total Quality Management to include more focus on improved and expanded learning for students. Some will use information technology as the catalyst to direct their efforts toward learning. Some community colleges will attempt to apply the experiences they have learned in their "shadow colleges," the divisions that customize education for business and industry, to other programs in the institution. Still others will launch their initiatives from a successful experiment with key innovations such as learning communities or classroom assessment.

Regardless of the point of departure, it will be helpful for those community colleges making visible commitments to becoming more learning-centered to create a frame of reference to serve as a guide for their journey. This frame of reference is more than a vision statement; it is a set of basic principles developed in the context of shared values among the institution's members. What do we really believe? and What can we really become? are questions that focus the institutional conversation.

From hundreds of such conversations over the past four decades, I have constructed a frame of reference that provides a point of departure for creating a more learning-centered college. It is offered here, not as a final answer or even a completely developed guide, but as an example of how the challenge can be approached. I hope this example I call "The Learning College" will serve as a catalyst to assist community colleges in creating their own sets of principles or frameworks to guide their efforts to become more learning-centered institutions.

The learning college places learning first and provides educational experiences for learners anyway, anyplace, anytime (O'Banion 1995-96, p. 22). The model is based on the assumption that educational experiences are designed for the convenience of learners rather than for the convenience of institutions and their staffs. The term "the learning college" is used as a generic reference for all institutions of higher education.

The learning college is based on six key principles:

- The learning college creates substantive change in individual learners.
- The learning college engages learners in the learning process as full partners, assuming primary responsibility for their own choices.
- The learning college creates and offers as many options for learning as possible.
- The learning college assists learners to form and participate in collaborative learning activities.
- The learning college defines the roles of learning facilitators by the needs of the learners.
- The learning college and its learning facilitators succeed only when improved and expanded learning can be documented for its learners.

Principle I

The learning college creates substantive change in individual learners. If the current reform efforts are worth the energy and time they will require, then community colleges should settle for nothing less than substantive change in individual learners. That is a goal highly desired from educational experiences for our own children and all those in our care. No faculty member, administrator, support staff, or trustee will argue with this principle, but it is not often held up visibly as a principle to guide action. Stated upfront and stated often it can become embedded in the institutional culture, undergirding all other principles.

Institutional priorities, however, usually focus on organizing data on the more obvious outcomes of learning and are most often reported for groups: rates of graduation, persistence, or employment for selected cohorts. This is important information and must be collected by all institutions to satisfy external constituencies and to gauge average institutionwide success.

But this general information provides only a rudimentary measure of institutional effectiveness. At some point in their efforts to become more learning-centered institutions, community college staff members will engage in a series of rich conversations about other definitions of learning. There will be discussions regarding the differences among training, education, and learning. Complex constructs regarding basic learning, hardy learning, and more powerful learning will emerge from the discussion of personal values and experience in education.

In my definition, learning kindles new ways of seeing, thinking, and doing that lead to changed behavior. If that definition is even partially correct, then the institutional participants engaged in a conversation about learning may encounter new ways of seeing, thinking, and doing–leading to changes in their behavior. In the learning college, substantive change in individual learners occurs in administrators, faculty, support staff, and trustees, as well as in students. Making learning a central topic of institutional conversation and agreeing that substantive change in individual learners is a basic institutional principle make the current reform effort a great deal more than business as usual.

Principle II

The learning college engages learners in the learning process as full partners, assuming primary responsibility for their own choices. At the point a learner chooses to engage the learning college, a series of services will be initiated to prepare the learner for the experiences and opportunities to come. Until there is a seamless system of education for lifelong learning based on principles similar to those of the learning college, these services will be heavily focused on orienting the learner to new experiences and expectations that are not usually found in traditional schools. Two key expectations will be communicated to new learners at the first stage of engagement: 1) learners are full partners in the creation and implementation of their learning experiences, and 2) learners will assume primary responsibility for making their own choices about goals and options.

The services will include assessing the learner's abilities, achievements, values, needs, goals, expectations, resources, and environmental or situational limitations. A personal profile will be constructed by the learner in consultation with an expert assessor to illustrate what this learner knows, wants to know, and needs to know. The learner's self-assessment will be a key activity. A personal learning plan will be constructed from this personal profile, and the learner will negotiate a contract that outlines responsibilities of both the learner and the learning college.

As part of the contract, the learner will be responsible for selecting from among the learning options provided by the learning college. The assessment information, the terms of the contract, historical records from previous learning experiences, external evaluations, work experience, and all other pertinent information will be recorded on the learner's "smart card", which serves as a portfolio of information, a lifelong record of lifelong educational experiences. The "smart card," similar to an Automated Teller Machine (ATM) card already widely used by banks, will belong to the learner, who will be responsible for keeping it current with assistance from specialists in the learning college. In addition to the "smart card," other educational institutions and employers will develop their own systems to verify what they need to know about the learner.

The learning college will also provide orientation and experimentation for learners who are unfamiliar with the learning environment of the learning college. Some learners will need training in using technology, in developing collaborations, in locating resources, and in navigating learning systems. Specialists will monitor these services carefully and will be responsible for approving a learner's readiness to

fully engage the learning opportunities provided.

In the learning college, the orientation and experimentation process will take as much time as necessary to meet the needs of each learner. Some learners seeking minimal learning experiences about which they are very clear can begin their activities immediately following their first point of engagement. Some learners will want to participate in the orientation and experimentation process for a few days or a few weeks. Some learners may be engaged in the process for several months. Since there will be no restrictions on time and place for the engagement, there will be no limitations governing the activities except the needs of the learner. There will be many options for learners to engage the learning college, including self-guided print and video modules, live and Internet-based activities, classes and laboratories "on-campus," and individual consultations with a variety of specialists. Continuing learners will soon learn to navigate the learning college system and use it to their full advantage.

The student will not, however, drive all the choices regarding learning. Colleges are collections of wise educators who know a great deal about the larger values associated with a college education. Faculty may want to require selected liberating experiences for students. A college might, for example, require all students to provide some service to the community, examine their views on diversity, develop special skills such as how to access the Internet, express their creativity in some art form, or understand some special feature of their culture. A college has the right, perhaps even the responsibility, to provide the fullest education possible for its students. Its goal is not always best achieved if the collegiate experience is reduced to a K-Mart in which the customers select only the items with which they are already familiar.

Community colleges attempt to provide experiences that will broaden and deepen the thinking of their students through such programs as critical thinking across the curriculum or a required general education core of courses. And community college faculty and administrators should continue to struggle with what constitutes a common core of learning for all their students. However, in a more learning-centered college the options for *how* individuals will learn the common core will be greatly increased. The goal is to provide liberating experiences agreed upon by the faculty that are free of the constraints of the historical educational architecture.

Principle III

The learning college creates and offers as many options for learning as possible. In the learning college there are many options for the learner in initial engagement and in continuing educational activities–options regarding time, place, structure, staff support, and methods of delivery. The learner has reviewed these options and experimented with some that are unfamiliar.

Each learning option includes specific goals and competency levels needed for entry, as well as specific outcome measures of competency levels needed for exit. Learning colleges are constantly creating additional learning options for learners, many of them suggested by learners from their own experiences. A major goal of the learning college is to create as many learning options as possible in order to provide successful learning experiences for all learners. If one option does not work, the learner should be able to navigate a new path to an alternative learning option at any point.

If a learning college had to develop a full array of options from scratch, the task would be overwhelming and too costly. Fortunately, there is a tremendous variety of resources available, many of them field tested and free. Thousands of individual faculty members have designed improved or alternative learning materials as part of their sabbaticals, on released time during regular terms, on summer projects, with innovation grants from various institutions, and with support from federal and foundation grants. Individual colleges have initiated programs to design and develop new learning opportunities for students, sometimes with a considerable commitment of college resources. Colleges have initiated consortia to work in collaboration with each other and with agencies and companies to produce new learning programs. State and federal agencies, and most especially the military, have created hundreds of learning options that are free. Business and industry have spent billions on

training materials. Educational entrepreneurs such as book publishers, testing agencies, information networks, training organizations, and computer corporations are in the specific business of developing training materials often available to educational institutions for a fee paid by the students.

To "manage" the activities and progress of thousands of learners engaged in hundreds of learning options at many different times, at many different levels, in many different locations, the learning college will rely on expert systems based on early developments such as General Motors' Computer-Aided Maintenance System or Miami-Dade Community College's Synergy Integrator. Without these complex technological systems the learning college cannot function. These learning management systems are the breakthroughs that will free education and educators from the time-bound, place-bound, and role-bound systems that currently "manage" the educational enterprise.

Principle IV

The learning college assists learners to form and participate in collaborative learning activities. In the learning college, the university ideal of a "community of scholars" is transformed into a "community of learners." More than just cute word play, the focus on creating communities among participants in the learning process–including not just students but also the faculty, administrators, and support staff–on creating student cohorts, and on developing social structures that support individual learning is a requirement of a learning college.

Practitioners, as well as researchers, know that group interaction can be very helpful to individual learning. There are examples of effective collaborative learning models at all levels of education. We also know from experience that programs designed to build cohorts of students and then to engage them in a common experience or curriculum greatly increase retention and ultimately program completion. Nursing programs in community colleges have some of the highest success rates in all of education, in part because they are often highly selective, but also because a cohort is guided together through a rigorous competency-based curriculum. Nursing students study together and support each other, and there is no disincentive for all to succeed at high levels because students are not graded relative to each other (as on a Bell curve) but relative to a performance standard.

The most widespread form of collaborative learning in the community college takes place in "learning communities," a specific term that is a curricular intervention to enhance collaboration and expand learning. "Learning communities . . . purposefully restructure the curriculum to link together courses or course work so that students find greater coherence in what they are learning, as well as increased intellectual interaction with faculty and fellow students" (Gablenick *et. al.* 1990, p. 5). These collaborations are also referred to as learning clusters, triads, federated learning communities, coordinated studies, and integrated studies; but "learning communities" has emerged as the favorite descriptor. When the same 30 students enroll for nine credit hours in a sequence of courses under the rubric of "Reading, Writing, and Rats," they have enrolled in a learning community.

In the learning college some learning communities and collaborative learning activities will not look very much like classrooms, and many will have dynamics defined by characteristics of pace, distance, membership, and means of communication. For instance, as the number of adult workers returning to college for education and training continues to grow, a likely venue for establishing learning communities will be in the workplace. Workplaces that value and encourage lifelong learning–whether because of altruism or enlightened self-interest–will make ideal sites for communities of learners, as common interest may be easier to determine and the level of resources available to support the community may be very high. For instance, video-on-demand can distribute information, including interactive training modules, directly to the desktop of employees; information resources can be concentrated at a common work location; and assessment services or learning specialists can be housed at the work site as desired.

Powerful networking technology can also help nurture a learning community by assisting its members to communicate with each other

regularly in both synchronous and asynchronous modes. Certainly if courtship can be accomplished in Cyberspace, then learning communities can be formed there. The Electronic Forums established in the Maricopa Community Colleges are pioneering efforts to create communities of learners through technology networks.

The roles that college educators will play in forming and supporting learning communities are yet to be thoroughly defined. However, in a learning college, staff will form and recruit students into cohorts of common interests or circumstances. Process facilitators will orient individuals and help them form groups or communities of learners. Resource specialists will attend to the resource needs of both individuals and groups of learners. Learning facilitators will design experiences that build upon and use group strengths and other dynamics. Assessment specialists will design and implement authentic assessments that can occur both individually and in the context of the learning community. The learning college will be designed not only around the unique needs of individual learners but also around their needs for association. The learning college will foster and nourish communities of learners as an integral part of its design and as a key process for creating substantive change in individual learners.

Principle V

The learning college defines the roles of learning facilitators by the needs of the learners. Everyone employed in the learning college will be a learning facilitator, including categories formerly designated administration or support staff. Trustees will also be considered learning facilitators as they exercise their responsibilities for governance and policy development in creating a more learning-centered institution. Every employee will be directly linked to learners in the exercise of his or her duties, although some activities such as accounting may be more indirectly related. The goal is to have every employee thinking about how his or her work facilitates the learning process.

When the current members of the staff do not have the skills to meet the needs of the learners, the learning college will contract with specialists to provide the needed services. Specialists will be employed on a contract basis to produce specific products or deliver specific services; some will work full time, but many will work part time, often from their homes, linked to the institution and to learners through technology. A number of specialists will be scattered around the world providing unique services and special expertise.

The groundwork is already being prepared for these new roles to emerge. A 1996 report by the Ohio Technology in Education Steering Committee recommended the term "learning consultant" to best describe the educator of the future. "As learning consultants, educators will play many roles:

- Learning consultants will be mentors–guiding each learner to his or her own chosen goals.
- Learning consultants will be facilitators of inquiry–coaching learners and helping them remove barriers as they move toward discovery.
- Learning consultants will be architects of connection–observing the needs of individual learners and joining them to information experiences, resources, experts, and teams.
- Learning consultants will be managers of collaboration and integration–combining the needs and abilities of *their* learning communities with the needs and abilities of *other* learning communities" (1996, p. 13).

Learners will also participate as learning facilitators, and this role could be made part of the options negotiated in the orientation process. Many will not have time, but others will welcome the opportunity to offer their experience and knowledge to assist other learners. Colleges already use students as lab assistants and tutors to facilitate learning. In the learning college, these roles and opportunities will be expanded to capitalize on the resources students bring.

The goal of Principle V is to use the resources of the institution to better meet the needs of students, but it is also designed to free faculty from the restrictions placed on them by the

historical role-bound architecture of education. In actual practice, colleges try to implement this principle by employing specialists (counselors, librarians, instructional designers, staff development trainers, etc.) and releasing selected teaching faculty from a class or two to conduct special projects. But the common denominator of the traditional role-bound model–one full-time faculty member teaching four or five courses each term–continues to dominate most of the thinking and most of the action in the institution. An audit of the great variety of skills and expertise residing in the current faculty would be mind-boggling in its richness and complexity. Changing the historical architecture of education to allow the skills and expertise of the faculty to be better matched to the needs of learners would be an overwhelmingly complex task, but a task that could lead to more satisfied and successful faculty and students.

Principle VI

The learning college and its learning facilitators succeed only when improved and expanded learning can be documented for its learners. "What does this learner know?" and "What can this learner do?" are questions that provide the framework for documenting outcomes, both for the learner and the learning facilitators. If the ultimate goal of the learning college is to promote and expand learning, then these questions mark the yardstick by which the learning college and staff are measured. Conventional information may be assembled for students (retention rates and achievement scores) and for faculty (ratings by students, peers, and supervisors, and community service), but the goal will be to document what students know and what they can do and to use this information as the primary measure of success for the learning facilitators and the learning college.

All learning options in the learning college utilize competency requirements for entrance and for exit. These competencies reflect national and state standards when available, or they have been developed by specialists on staff or on special contract. Assessing a learner's readiness for a particular learning option is a key part of the initial engagement process and thereafter a continuing process embedded in the culture of the institution.

Learners negotiate and sign contracts for overall programs (general education core, basic skills, workplace skills, etc.) and may need to negotiate specific contracts for some learning options whether part of a program or not. Moreover, learners will be encouraged to add competencies and goals beyond those established in the standards.

Portfolio assessment will be one of the primary means by which learning is documented. A portfolio is a systematic and organized collection of evidence of what the learner knows and what the learner can do. It builds on prior information, is in constant use through revision and updates, and provides continuity for future learning activities. Specific benchmarks of achievement may be applied to determine credits earned if credits continue to be the hallmarks for moving learners along a seamless path of education.

Guiding the portfolio assessment process will be one of the primary functions of learning facilitators. Since many of the learning options will be stand-alone, student-led collaborations, contracts with specialists, or facilitated by tutors and coaches, learning facilitators will have more time for the portfolio assessment. It may be possible to codify some of the assessment process for easier management, and advances in technology will provide some assistance.

These six principles form the core of the learning college. They refer primarily to process and structure and are built on the basic philosophy that the student is central in all activities of the educational enterprise. There are certainly other principles that must be considered in creating a new paradigm of learning, loosely coupled here into a concept designated "the learning college." Content, funding, and governance are examples of pertinent issues that must be addressed and for which principles must be designed. Still, these six principles provide a starting point for those who wish to create a more learning-centered college, a college that places learning first and provides educational experiences for learners anyway, anyplace, anytime.

Six Colleges Take Their First Steps

A small vanguard of leading community colleges is beginning to experiment with new approaches to placing learning first, implementing new practices and programs to make their institutions more learning-centered. Six community colleges have been identified by the author that are committed to institutionwide efforts to place learning and learners as central to all their efforts: Community College of Denver (Colorado), Jackson Community College (Michigan), Lane Community College (Oregon), Maricopa Community Colleges (Arizona), Palomar College (California), and Sinclair Community College (Ohio). The early experiences of these colleges are informative for other colleges that plan on exploring how to respond to the new emphasis on learning. Although each college initiated its activities in terms of its own culture, there are common elements that reflect beginning steps or practices that may be useful to other colleges. The common elements are listed here as four first steps on the journey to become a more learning-centered institution; more detail on additional steps and individual practices and policies of the six colleges can be found in *A Learning College for the 21st Century* (O'Banion 1997).

Recast Statements of Mission and Values to Focus on Learning

There will often be months of institutional thrashing about before some key leaders begin to speak about the need to better assess outcomes or the need to better serve customers or the need to reengineer programs to reflect declining resources. Every institution begins its journey based on its own character, culture, and community; at some point, however, it becomes clear that the kind of institutional change called for in the current situation is so substantive that a review of mission and basic values is required.

If learning is to be the central focus of a learning-centered institution, then learning must be the central focus of mission and value statements. When college members engage this issue, there will be a great deal of discussion and frustration, but it is an early step that cannot be avoided. Revised or new statements are created after much soul-searching and reflect new values held in common by very different groups. These statements are not easily developed, but once college members travel the long, hard road leading to consensus, they will have a vision to guide them for the rest of their journey.

The following brief excerpts from several new mission statements reveal the new focus on learning.

- *Jackson Community College is a community of learners.*
- *Lane Community College provides quality learning experiences in a caring environment. Above all, Lane must put the learner first by shifting more and more to a learner-focused organization.*
- *Learning is a process which is lifelong for everybody and should be measured in a consistent, ongoing manner focused on improvement.* (Maricopa Community Colleges)
- *We see ourselves as a learning institution in both our object and our method.* (Palomar College)

These statements are taken out of context and do not do justice to the complete and more elegant statements developed by the colleges, but they do provide a flavor of the new ideas beginning to percolate in community colleges. Any community college planning to become more learning-centered will eventually be involved in a review and revision, if not complete overhaul, of its mission and values statements.

Realign Current Structures to Accommodate Collaboration and Teamwork Within the College Community

Many community colleges are involved in restructuring and reengineering their institutions in response to changing conditions. The increasing use of technology, the expanding diversity of students, the demand for a better-prepared work force, and declining support of education are only some of the reasons

institutions of higher education are involved in reviewing their missions, their programs, and their practices. More and more, leaders in higher education are beginning to realize there is more involved than realigning the existing institution to improve on current practice. Leaders are beginning to realize they are engaged in a major reform that transcends the efforts to tinker with and tweak a few programs here and there. The entire system of higher education, and its supportive architecture, is being called into question; answers lead to a major change that places learning front and center. Jerry Moskus, president of Lane Community College, recognized this challenge in 1993 and said to the faculty and staff, "Lane must rethink nearly everything it does."

Leaders at Lane initiated their institutionwide effort to become a learning-centered college by examining in great detail their current organizational structure. All faculty and staff were invited to participate, and eventually a new organizational structure was created based upon a new vision that placed learning at the center of all their activities.

Community colleges that begin the journey to become more learning-centered will almost always reorganize their current structure to ensure more collaboration and teamwork among institutional members. Traditional hierarchical structures designed for control and efficiency do not elicit the kind of creativity and commitment required for learning-centered institutions. Colleges that are reorganizing to become more learning-centered reflect the ideas of Deming, Juran, Senge, and Wheatley regarding the need to flatten organizations, empower individuals, and involve all stakeholders. Community colleges are finding their own voice regarding structural changes, as noted in the following:

- *To leverage structural change, Maricopa agreed that changing the learning paradigm from a traditional one, to a current, more learner-centered approach was the vehicle to more comprehensive, and even profound, structural change.*
- *Organizations that move routine decision making and problem solving to work teams are better able to adapt to continued change. We must break down the walls between departments by designing our processes and services around work teams that cut across artificial organizational lines.* (Lane Community College)
- *Palomar College empowers our educational team–faculty, staff, and administration–to create powerful learning environments.*
- *Effective organization change is really the relationship between structure, strategy, systems, style, skills, and staff, and something called shared values.* (Sinclair Community College)

The form of the new organizational structure created by community colleges moving toward a more learning-centered paradigm is not nearly as important as the long and sometimes chaotic processes colleges use to create new structures. And more important than the processes used are the new values that emerge from the willingness to engage in the processes. Community colleges that plan to reorganize to become more learning-centered will learn little from the diagrams and charts that illustrate new structures developed by other colleges. All of the essence lies between the lines and around the boxes and can be understood and appreciated only through direct experience applied to one's own situation.

Involve All Stakeholders

In a community college the key stakeholders include administrators, full-time faculty, students, support staff, and trustees. Depending on the culture of the institution and its capacity to manage complexity, part-time faculty and community representatives should be included as well. Determining the groups to be represented in creating a more learning-centered institution is a crucial first step.

The new "science" of management and leadership that prescribes flattened organizations, open communication, and empowered participation makes a strong case for involving all stakeholders in major reform efforts. Margaret Wheatley, a consultant on organizational change, says, "Any change program that insists on

defining how things ought to be done, that tries to impose a structure on everyone–without their involvement–works against our natural tendencies" (In Brown 1994, p. 24).

Wheatley goes on to explain:

> You need deep and meaningful involvement of the whole organization. This seems like an insurmountable barrier, to involve the whole organization, but I believe the starting point for real change is to focus energy and direction on this one key question: "Can we involve the expertise and experience of *everyone* in the organization?" We can't ignore that question. We've got to figure out how we can avoid the temptation to design things for people instead of engaging them in creating their own responses to change (*Ibid.*, p. 26).

Few community college leaders will argue against the importance of involving all stakeholders in the process of creating a learning-centered institution, but many will be challenged about how to do this. It is more practical to set a goal of involving everyone who wants to participate by providing numerous opportunities for their participation. Staff members can participate in institutionwide convocations, workshops and seminars, and special training sessions. Staff development programs can be reengineered to focus on activities related to learning-centered efforts. In-house newsletters can provide important information regarding project activities. In some cases, a special publication will need to be created to carry the message for the learning initiative. Copies of key documents, such as the vision statement and the framework of guiding principles, and later documents, such as new policies for assessing students or selecting faculty or rewarding and promoting support staff that will evolve from project activities, will need to be sent to every member of the college community for review and response. Universal agreement is not the goal; universal opportunity to participate is, and some changes may need to be put to a vote.

Create an Open System of Communication

Convening a single meeting and distributing one key paper about the initiative to become more learning-centered as the only strategies for change will doom the effort to an early death. This is not an undertaking that can succeed by tossing one stone in the pond and following up on the ripples. Creating a learning-centered institution means tossing hundreds of stones into the pond, dumping boulders into the pond, and perhaps even filling in the pond and digging a new one. This kind of change will not occur unless the members of the community college are kept fully and constantly informed about what is happening and unless there are mechanisms provided whereby they can communicate across the entire community of participants. Fortunately, technological innovations such as listserv now exist, and these are being put in place in many community colleges, allowing for a rich exchange of information and opportunities for connecting individuals and groups that usually function in the margins.

Wilson says, "If a vision is to shape the future and drive action, then the leader–and others in executive positions–must communicate it broadly, consistently, and continuously, until it becomes an integral part of the organization's culture" (1996, p. 5). The message must be driven home again and again through speeches, newsletters, meetings, articles, interviews, surveys, and actions.

As college constituents become convinced that the leadership is engaged in a serious commitment to become more learning-centered, there will be a tremendous release of creativity and ideas that individuals will want to share. There must be highly visible and readily accessible mechanisms in place to allow for this outpouring of ideas. Mechanisms must also be in place to link people with common suggestions and concerns, to capture and record suggestions and ideas, and to incorporate these perspectives in creating a new culture that is learning-centered.

A project manager is often appointed to ensure that mechanisms are in place for the communication that is needed. In some community colleges, a task force with representation from all groups will ensure

institutionwide communication. The CEO of the college will need to take responsibility for many "official" roles in communicating about the project activities, as well as many unofficial ones. Leaders in the faculty and support staff must be involved and speak out in support of project activities. As the project emerges and matures, more and more participants will take responsibility for communicating their needs and their ideas if they see that these are taken seriously.

These four initial steps appear to be common for all community colleges that begin the journey to become more learning-centered. The specifics of these steps are idiosyncratic to the culture of the institution and the character and abilities of its leaders. The steps are not as linear or formulaic as they appear to be in these written descriptions. In actuality, all four steps occur simultaneously and are often not even identifiable until they are almost completed. All four steps appear as guidelines or practices to follow, and at the same time, they are explicit value statements. For a college ready to launch an initiative to become more learning-centered, these four steps are a good place to begin.

Key Issues and Challenges

The kind and amount of change called for in becoming a more learning-centered community college–the complete overhaul of the traditional architecture of education to place learning first–will be a formidable task, even for the most healthy and best-endowed institutions. Change always creates tension, and major change creates major tension. Educational leaders who embrace the learning-centered concept can expect a life filled with tension, and a review of some of the key issues and challenges that lie ahead will help them prepare for the long haul.

These key issues and challenges should be reviewed and discussed in depth–perhaps as a series of organized staff development seminars–early in the creation of an institutionwide initiative to become a more learning-centered college. If faculty, administrators, and support staff can come to an early understanding of and perhaps even agreement about some of the obstacles they will face, their efforts will have a greater chance for success.

The Teaching versus Learning Red Herring

Many reform efforts never get beyond heated discussions of differences in perceptions of the meaning of core concepts. The most volatile concept in the language of the new emphasis on learning appears when teaching and learning is cast as "teaching versus learning." In the early days of the current reform efforts, only a few years ago, a number of writers and speakers–including this one–tried to frame the issue in terms of teaching versus learning. The argument was made that the community college places more value on teaching than it does on learning, and it is easy to cite evidence to support the argument (*Building Communities* 1988, Barr 1994, Barr and Tagg 1995).

Community colleges often take great pride in comparing their commitment to teaching to the university's commitment to research. To drive the point home, community college advocates often note the university's propensity to use graduate students to staff large lecture sessions while they, more committed to quality teaching, make teaching the priority of professional staff. In the early 1990s, community colleges began to establish endowed teaching chairs, their version of the university's endowed research chairs. Endowed teaching chairs have now been established in dozens of community colleges across the country as one of the most visible expressions of the community college's commitment to teaching.

In retrospect, the community college *has* placed great value on teaching, but that does not mean that the community college does not also place great value on learning. To the contrary, every community college teacher understands that the basic purpose of teaching is to help students learn. Learning is the end, and teaching is the primary means to that end. Even the California State University System's Academic Senate defines "*learning*, the product of teaching" (1996).

The "teaching versus learning" debate is a red herring that serves only to divide and create rancor. It unnecessarily puts faculty on the defensive and unfairly demeans their commitments and contributions to the educational enterprise. The debate has no value in the conversations that must occur about the core concepts of teaching *and* learning and should be locked away in some Pandora's box where it belongs.

Having said that is not to deny that the language of teaching may overwhelm the language of learning in current mission statements, job descriptions, and program statements. It will be the task of those engaged in creating a more learning-centered perspective to right the balance and to examine whether practices, programs, and policies are influenced when learning takes a more visible place alongside that of teaching. There is ample room and great need for both in educational institutions of the twenty-first century.

Learning Organizations

Learning organization is a term popular in business and industry that is becoming increasingly adapted to institutions of higher education. Garvin suggests that "A learning organization is

an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights" (1993, p. 80). The goal is to create a "community of commitment" among the members of an organization so they can function more fully and more openly to achieve the goals of the organization.

Peter Senge chartered the territory of the learning organization in his 1990 book, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Senge describes the learning organization as one in which "people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (p. 3). According to Senge, a learning organization depends upon five disciplines: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, and team learning. Through these disciplines, a college will flatten its organization; develop models of collaboration for faculty, administrators, and support staff; develop processes for evaluating and reviewing its goals; and involve all stakeholders in learning better how to do their jobs.

A number of community colleges are attracted to the concept of the learning organization and have begun to apply some of the processes developed by Senge and his colleagues. Because they are familiar with the language of the learning organization, many community college leaders, especially presidents, assume they are engaged in creating more learning-centered institutions as a result of their interest in and compliance with the processes of the learning organization. It is quite possible, however, for a college to flatten its hierarchy, open the information flow, focus on whole systems, work together in teams, and develop flexible structures designed to enhance the continuing involvement of all members of the college's community and still retain models of the historical architecture of education. In some ways, a learning organization is designed for the staff of the institution, while a learning-centered institution is designed for the students. There is no guarantee that a learning organization will become a learning-centered institution placing learning first for students unless those values are made clearly visible as the primary goal of a learning organization.

The basic concept of the learning organization, however, provides a powerful foundation on which to build a learning-centered institution. The concepts and processes of the learning organization are highly compatible with the concepts and processes of a learning-centered institution. Community colleges engaged in creating a learning organization have established an excellent foundation for launching an institutionwide initiative to become a more learning-centered college.

The Language of Learning

At the present time, many colleges use the terms "learning communities," "learning organizations," and "learning colleges"–along with "learner-centered" and "learning-centered"–as if they all meant the same thing. These terms do have a great deal in common as reflections of various aspects of the new emphasis on learning, but individuals do apply different meanings to these terms. It will be helpful if participants within an institution can agree on a common vocabulary to guide the institutional conversation.

One of the pitfalls of glibly adopting a new language is that it can give the appearance of change while old beliefs and behaviors are retained. Seasoned community college educators can spot with ease those who do not "walk the talk." Faculty are fully aware of administrators who trot out new language that is not fortified with new beliefs and new behaviors. Such action is a vacuous exercise that serves only to harden existing layers of cynicism. All members of the college community engaged in helping their institution to become more learning-centered should work hard to ensure that new practices, programs, and policies reflect the language they all agree best reflects these values and intentions.

As community colleges explore and experiment with becoming more learning-centered institutions, there is an opportunity to create a new language about learning, a community college-specific language. In the past,

community colleges have borrowed a great deal of language from universities and four-year colleges to describe their values and their practices. Currently, community colleges are busy adapting language from business and industry. Surely there is a special language of learning embedded in the idiosyncratic experiences of community college faculty and staff as they continue decade after decade to provide learning opportunities for the most challenging learners in all of higher education. Among institutions of higher education, community colleges have long been one of the institutions most committed to learning. The creative mavericks who will lead community colleges to a new emphasis on learning should give some thought to creating their own language to reflect the unique perspectives they will bring to the task of building more learning-centered institutions.

We Are Already Innovating As Fast As We Can

Faculty members, administrators, and support staff in community colleges take great pride in their innovations and in the innovative spirit with which they approach problems and opportunities. Innovation has become such an important value in the community college that it is often listed along with the open-door philosophy, student-centeredness, and teaching as an identifying characteristic of the community college movement.

Innovations can now be understood as the struggles of creative faculty and administrators to change the historical architecture of education that acts as a barrier to change. The effort to break down the traditional architecture of education is probably the motivating impulse for most educational innovation. It can be amply illustrated that many current innovations have been designed as specific interventions to address the limitations placed on teaching and learning by the time-bound, place-bound, bureaucracy-bound, and role-bound architecture inherited from earlier times.

In summary, open-entry/open-exit programs, distance learning, and computerized assessment testing are good illustrations of innovations designed to change the time-bound architecture. Many creative faculty have been trying to break out of the classroom for years, recognizing that the classroom and the campus are architectural constructs that can limit a student's and a faculty member's access to learning. Again, distance learning is a boundary breaker, but so are innovations in service learning and school-to-work programs. Learning communities, project-based education, and electronic forums are good examples of recent innovations designed to change the bureaucracy-bound model of education. Customized training programs, classroom assessment, and peer tutors are innovations that aim to break down historical restrictions on the role of faculty.

A case can be made that innovations in general are designed to bring about change and are, therefore, important elements in reform efforts. Many innovations certainly do create improved opportunities for students to learn and expanded opportunities for teachers to teach in new and creative ways. Most innovations, however, do not create major institutionwide change. In fact, most innovations emerge in isolation as stand-alone programs or practices championed by a select group whose members are often unaware of or uninterested in other innovations percolating throughout the institution. Even when innovators are encouraged with special institutional grants and institutional recognition, they still operate largely in isolation in terms of bringing about any institutionwide change. Few individual innovators are able to transcend the insular, bureaucratic structure of the college to connect their work and their energy to substantive, institutionwide change.

The moment waits for a visionary leader to create a new framework from existing innovations by cobbling together these innovative practices and programs into a newly assembled *gestalt*. If the energy and creativity of an institution's innovators could be channeled into a common cause and focused on changing the historical architecture prevalent everywhere in education, substantial educational reform could become a reality for many community colleges.

Can Guardians Become Advocates?

Most educators are familiar with the observation that changing the curriculum (or making any

major change in education for that matter) is as difficult as moving a cemetery: you get no help from the residents.

All successful guardians of a process, a program, an institution tend to protect what has been created. And that is a central challenge for today's educators, for most educators have been successful within the framework of the traditional architecture of education. Why would instructors or administrators want to make major changes in a system that has rewarded them for performing well as students or has provided them with fairly attractive jobs? Educators are successful navigators of the current educational system, and while they recognize it is not a perfect system, many believe they work effectively for change within the existing boundaries.

It is generally acknowledged that the creators or guardians of a program or institution will find the task of making changes formidable. The following quotation on this challenge is attributed to George Washington:

> One of the difficulties in bringing about change in an organization is that you must do so through the persons who have been successful in that organization, no matter how faulty the system or organization is. To such persons, you see, it is the best of all possible organizations, because look who was selected by it and look who succeeded most within it. Yet these are the very people through whom we must bring about improvements.

If guardians are to become advocates, leaders of the change initiative must engage a core of devoted faculty members who will champion change. This group will likely include a number of faculty who are frustrated with the lack of change and lack of leadership to date and other faculty who are active change agents in the institution. Who selects the core members, who is selected, and how they are selected can be very delicate processes depending on the institutional culture, especially the trust levels that exist among the various groups. The formation of this group of advocates is a beginning step in helping other guardians in the institution become advocates.

Institutional leaders can also encourage guardians to become advocates by not making scapegoats of past leaders or previous actions. William Bridges (1993), a management consultant, suggests:

> Never denigrate the past. Many managers, in their enthusiasm for a future that is going to be better than the past, ridicule or talk slightingly about the old way of doing things. In doing so they consolidate the resistance against the transition because people identify with the way things use to be and thus feel their self-worth is at stake when the past is attacked (p. 30).

This is tricky business, of course. Changes of the magnitude called for in becoming a more learning-centered institution require giving up much that is familiar and creating much that is new. Leaders must strike a careful balance between these two goals. They are likely to be more successful in encouraging change if they can offer rational explanations for ending some practices and creating new ones, rather than beating up on the past in which individuals in the institution may have considerable personal investment.

Funding Learning

It would make a great deal of sense to fund the educational enterprise in terms of the kind and amount of learning that is produced, that is, to implement learning-based funding. However, neither external funding formulas nor internal resource allocation and workload systems in community colleges tend to be sensitive to what and how much students actually learn.

Current state funding formulas for community colleges generally allocate funds on the basis of average daily attendance or some other accepted calculation of full-time student equivalence–formulas designed for an industrial factory model of education. There are modest efforts underway in states such as Florida, Ohio, Tennessee, Illinois, Missouri, and Colorado to fund colleges based upon their performance in

producing certain outcomes, including student learning. However, the debate in these states over what kind of learning outcomes to fund, how to measure learning, and what formula to use to best match funding to learning outcomes is fairly indicative of the difficulty involved in any attempt to institute learning-based funding. To date, attempts to reward learning by earmarking special funds to encourage certain practices and programs have been minor, and most institutional officials seek to ensure that any performance-based state funding is either limited to a small percentage of their total institutional allocations or sought in addition to, not as a replacement for, traditional attendance-based funding.

So, other than as a modest and symbolic spur towards desired practice, states are not likely to contribute much to institutional movement toward learning-based funding. Rather, it appears that states contribute most to institutional flexibility by using funding models that are neutral, namely, that do not require institutions to maintain traditional place-bound, time-bound, and role-bound models of higher education. Perhaps the best public policy stance for a state to take that wishes to encourage a learning-centered focus in its publicly supported institutions–and for institutional leaders to recommend and lobby in support of–is to provide base appropriations to community colleges that are not directly tied to the production of credit hours. States such as Missouri, that have decoupled credit hours and funding, at least tacitly permit learning-centered innovation without the threat of lost funding.

Regardless of external funding mechanisms, internal resource allocation systems, especially those associated with workload calculations, are where the rubber meets the road for learning-based funding models. As long as colleges allocate their funds and human resources by the rules of the industrial model, little learning-centered movement is likely to occur. As long as the basic workload model is one full-time faculty member assigned to teach four or five classes of 120-150 students, as much as 80 percent of all of the institutional funds will be tied up in that model, leaving little with which to innovate toward learning-centeredness.

The challenge for colleges serious about becoming more learning-centered is to develop alternative workload models, and only a very few workable examples have yet to be applied broadly in many institutions. However, there are hints of solutions to this funding bottleneck. One alternative funding approach has been employed in support of learning communities. Instead of loading one faculty member with three separate sections of English composition, another with three sections of American history, and a third with three sections of psychology, colleges engaged in building learning communities have instead assigned these three same faculty to the total 75-90 students enrolled in the learning cohort defined by these three courses. While the workload calculations are the same, the freedom to provide learners with multiple learning options within the context of a three-course block are greatly expanded, and the faculty are still paid by a recognizably comfortable model. This model could also be extended to include funding, for instance, five faculty to provide multiple learning options to 250 full-time students, support by learning specialists, student development professionals, and other support staff–achieving similar ratios to the traditional workload formula but with greatly increased flexibility and ability to focus on the individual needs and constraints of different learners.

Another workload model that might be adapted to support learning-centered initiatives is that used in many hands-on and clinical-based occupational programs–and in some technical colleges–the 35-hour faculty work week. Rather than loading faculty on the basis of classes taught, many colleges routinely make assignments that conform to an overall contact hour standard, usually about 35 hours per week. While some faculty would abhor such a schedule, others find its simplicity and flexibility to support learners in whatever way appears appropriate during fixed hours without concern for complex load calculations to be liberating. Some faculty would be even more supportive of 35-hour weeks if these could be extended into eleven or twelve month contracts at prorated pay, rather than limited to nine months, increasing their earning opportunities substantially.

Other more complicated and radical models

are possible. For example, a college could attempt to develop a model to provide as many learning options as possible for 150 students who needed to succeed in achieving the learning outcomes of freshman composition. One possibility would be to assign one faculty member with the responsibility to assist these 150 students to earn the required competencies by whatever means the college could arrange. The instructor could meet some of these 150 students in a traditional class; others could work through course competencies over the Internet; others might use resource systems that are either text, video, or computer-based to achieve the required outcomes–with all of the various options managed by the lead faculty member but also supported by multiple learning specialists and support staff. Instead of building loads upon classes taught, the college could build loads based upon student learning outcomes.

Creative community colleges committed to becoming more learning-centered will be able to come up with better models than this one. It will be very important to consider different approaches to work load because the reallocation of resources is generally the only realistic option available to colleges to make some of the changes recommended in this monograph. However, reallocation will not be easy, for there is a great deal of mistrust on this issue. Nonetheless, resource allocation and reallocation, changed workload formulas, and alternative funding models must be faced early on in most community colleges if any real progress is to occur. There simply must be some breakthrough on how to make more effective use of the most critical and most expensive resource in the institution: the full-time faculty.

The Territorial Imperative: We versus They

The most formidable barrier to change in education today is the divide that grows ever wider between key groups in the institution. Full-time faculty, part-time faculty, administrators, support staff, trustees, and students stake out their territory and defend their turf. Their struggles are usually over resources or rights or power; the struggles are seldom about learning.

Educational institutions are a microcosm of the larger society and reflect the loss of community noted by Bellah and Associates in *Habits of the Heart* in which we limit our communication with each other primarily to a vocabulary of individualism. In 1981, K. Patricia Cross wrote an article suggesting that community colleges were on "a plateau between two periods of high energy and a sense of mission in the community colleges. The old ideals that sparked enthusiasm and the sense of common purpose in community colleges have receded, and new ideals have not yet emerged to take their place" (Cross 1981, p. 113).

More recently (1997) Cross reexamined the extent community college faculty rallied around a common purpose and discovered that faculty still feel a great sense of loss regarding community.

> When I asked the various constituencies of 18 geographically dispersed community colleges to rate the *Is* and *Should be* importance of 20 institutional goals, faculty (N=1064) rated the creation of a sense of community the most important goal for their college (First on "should be" goals) and near the bottom in actual accomplishment (18th out of 20 goals on "is" goals). The discrepancy between what existed and what was thought desirable was far greater on "community" than on any of the other 19 institutional goals (p. 30).

In some institutions of higher education, the loss of community and the open belligerence between some groups is such that there is no possibility of reasonable discourse on the institution becoming more learning-centered. The kind of change called for in the current reform effort cannot occur in unhealthy institutions where battle lines have been drawn between *we* and *they*.

Even in healthy institutions, the task of overhauling the entire architecture of education to place learning first will be so difficult that all members of the college need to be aware of the pitfalls they will encounter. They also need to be aware of the positive elements working in their favor that can provide the foundation for creating a more learning-centered institution.

It might be helpful for college members to

review the conditions that impede and conditions that support their efforts, especially in terms of the we versus they challenge. A visible listing of these sometimes invisible forces may improve communication and keep the initiative from floundering. Even the process of identifying these conditions can begin to build a common understanding and vocabulary that can expand the trust and commitment among key constituents. Every institution needs to compile its own list, but the following may offer some guidance as a point of departure:

Conditions That May Impede Change

1. Even when individuals recognize the need for change, they are often overwhelmed about how to articulate the framework for change that will be required.
2. Many of those who desire change doubt the ability of their colleagues to manage the transformation. At some point, because of the overwhelming nature of the task, everyone doubts his or her own ability.
3. Everyone complains about the time required to continue the present structure while they are also involved in creating a new structure. The task is to continue to serve three meals a day while the kitchen is being completely remodeled.
4. Many attempts at substantive change fail because college members have had few opportunities to develop the skills and knowledge required for major change. A massive in-house training program is required for all groups if the change process is to be understood and managed well.
5. Many colleges are trying to change the way they operate and how they communicate internally at the same time they launch major initiatives to change the way they educate their students. Some want to use the principles of Senge's "learning organization" to become a more learning-centered institution. These can be complementary or very separate goals; both require an extraordinary amount of time and effort and new learning.
6. Vested interests prevail and provide islands of comfort for many. Power struggles among divisions and campuses and between individual leaders increase the tension.
7. Once the change initiative begins to infiltrate the culture of the college, it is exceedingly difficult for any one individual to understand and articulate the big picture of what is going on.

Conditions That May Support Change

1. An overwhelming majority of college staff recognize the need for change. College staff are generally well read, up-to-date, and rational; they have a good understanding that the world in general and education in particular are going through a significant period of change.
2. Staff members like being part of a college culture where the need for change and an emerging vision for that change has begun to be articulated by its leaders. No faculty, administrator, or support staff wants to be part of a community college that proclaims, "There is no need for change here."
3. Those who work in community colleges are strongly committed to the basic values that undergird a learning-centered institution. They are rightly cynical about quick fixes and simplistic solutions, but every faculty member in a community college wants to be a better teacher; every administrator and member of the support staff wants to do a better job; everyone in the community college wants students to learn more; everyone in the community college wants the institution to improve its services to students and to the community.
4. Community colleges take great pride in their commitment to teaching, but not as an end in itself. Community college teachers and administrators have always understood that the purpose of teaching is to improve and expand learning. Because of its historical commitment to quality teaching, the community college is the ideal crucible in which to create a more learning-centered institution.

5. Community colleges have struggled for decades to teach the most diverse and most underprepared students ever to attend college. In the right situation, any improvement and support to perform these tasks more effectively will be welcomed.
6. New tools have emerged in the last decade in the form of improved assessment practices, new research on learning, and an expanding application of information technology. These new tools will help community college innovators to transform their colleges into more learning-centered institutions.
7. Community colleges have matured as institutions of higher education and are not as defensive as they were in earlier decades. Holding a well-deserved seat at the table of higher education, they are now positioned to take on national leadership in the continuing transformation of their culture toward a more learning-centered system.

EPILOGUE

The amount and kind of change going on in education today is enormous, and no institution is untouched by that change. Even if there were no major reform effort in progress, there would be major changes in the use of information technology, in governance and control, in student demographics, in funding and resources, in alliances and partnerships, and in innovations in teaching and management. But it is important not to mistake these related changes for the new emphasis on learning. These other changes will happen whether championed or not because they are natural processes reflecting transformations in the larger society. But it is possible for all these changes to develop over the next decade without a new emphasis on learning. A decade from now great changes in education will be clearly evident, but the traditional architecture of education could be pretty much in place, and learning could still not be the primary mission and outcome of educational institutions.

A new emphasis on learning must transcend all other changes in education and provide an overarching framework for the changes needed to place learning first. If two key goals guide the change process–1) overhauling the traditional architecture of education and 2) placing learning as the primary mission and outcome of education–then substantive change will be the result.

Finally, the measure of whether or not community colleges have been successful in becoming more learning-centered can be gauged by embedding two questions in the culture of the institution: *Does this action improve and expand learning? and How do we know this action improves and expands learning?* The educational institution that consciously and visibly links every action with learning and consciously and visibly evaluates the outcome of those linkages will be an institution engaged in becoming more learning-centered.

REFERENCES

Barr, Robert B. "A New Paradigm for the Community Colleges," *The News*, Published by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. San Diego Community College District, February 1994.

Barr, Robert B. and Tagg, John. "A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education," *Change*, Vol. 27, No. 6, November/December 1995.

Boggs, George R. "Community Colleges and the New Paradigm," *Celebrations*. Austin, Texas: National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development, September 1993.

Bridges, William. *Managing Transition: Making the Most of Change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1993.

Brown, Tom. An Interview with Margaret Wheatley. *Industry Week*, April 18, 1994.

California State University Academic Senate. "Faculty Productivity and Accountability." Unpublished paper, May 1996.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 1988.

Cross, K. Patricia. *Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction and Reshaping the Curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Community Colleges on the Plateau," *Journal of Higher Education* Vol. 52, No. 2, March/April 1981.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Developing Professional Fitness," *The Cross Papers*, No. 1, Mission Viejo: League for Innovation in the Community College, September 1997.

Daggett, Willard R. "Preparing Students for the 1990s and Beyond." Unpublished paper from the International Center for Leadership in Education, January 1992.

Dewey, John and Dewey, Evelyn. *Schools of Tomorrow*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1962.

Drucker, Peter T. *Managing for the Future: The 1990s and Beyond*. New York: Penguin, 1992.

Edgerton, Russell. *Higher Education White Paper*. Philadelphia: The Pew Charitable Trusts, September 1997.

Gabelnick, Faith *et. al. Learning Communities: Creating Connections Among Students, Faculty, and Disciplines*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Number 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Spring 1990.

Gales, R. "Can Colleges Be Reengineered?" *Across the Board: The Conference Board Magazine*, March 1994, pp. 31, 16-22.

Garvin, David A. "Building a Learning Organization," *Harvard Business Review*, July/August 1993.

Guskin, Alan E. "Restructuring the Role of Faculty," *Change*, September/October 1994.

Higher Education Research Institute. "The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey." Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles. In The *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 26, 1992, p. 30.

Kirp, David L. "Those Who Can't: 27 Ways of Looking at a Classroom." *Change*, Vol. 29, No. 3, May/June 1997.

Leonard, George. "The End of School," *The Atlantic*, Vol. 269, No. 5, May 1992.

Lovett, Clara M. "Small Steps to Achieve Big Changes," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 24, 1995.

"The Learning Revolution," *Business Week*, February 28, 1994, pp. 80-88.

"The Learning Revolution," *Time*, Spring 1995, p. 49-51.

Marchese, Ted. "Getting Smarter about Teaching," *Change*, September/October 1995.

Moe, Roger. Cited in Armajani, Babak, et al. *A Model for the Reinvented Higher Education System: State Policy and College Learning*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, January 1994.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1983.

National Education Commission on Time and Learning. *Prisoners of Time*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1994.

Nussbaum, Thomas J. "Too Much Law. . .Too Much Structure: Together We Can Cut the Gordian Knot." Paper delivered at the 1992 Annual Convention of the Community College League of California.

O'Banion, Terry. *A Learning College for the 21st Century*. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1997.

O'Banion, Terry. "A Learning College for the 21st Century," *Community College Journal*, December/January 1995-96.

Oblinger, Diana G. and Rush, Sean C. (Eds.) *The Learning Revolution*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 1997.

Ohio Technology in Education Steering Committee. *Technology in the Learning Communities of Tomorrow: Beginning the Transformation*. Ohio Board of Regents, March 1996.

Perelman, Lewis J. *School's Out: A Radical New Formula for the Revitalization of America's Educational System*. New York: Avon Books, 1992.

Peters, Roger. "Some Snarks Are Boojums: Accountability and the End(s) of Higher Education," *Change*, November/December 1994.

Plater, William M. "Future Work: Faculty Time in the Twenty-First Century," *Change*, May/June 1995.

Pollio, H. *What Students Think about and Do in College Lecture Classes*. Teaching-Learning Issues, No. 53, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, Learning Research Center, 1984.

Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Sizer, Theodore R. *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School.* Boston: Houghton, 1984.

Terenzini, Patrick T. and Pascarella, Ernest T. "Living With Myths: Undergraduate Education in America," *Change*, January/February 1994.

Toffler, Alvin and Toffler, Heidi. "Getting Set for the Coming Millennium," *The Futurist*, March/April 1995.

Wilson, Ian. "The Practical Power of Vision," *On the Horizon* Vol. 4, No. 2, March/April 1996.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education.* Racine, Wisconsin: The Johnson Foundation, Inc., 1993.

PEOPLESOFT, INC.

PeopleSoft, Inc. was established in 1987 to provide innovative software solutions that meet the changing business demands of enterprises worldwide. By understanding our customers' needs and requirements, PeopleSoft is able to deliver real business benefits to help organizations thrive in today's competitive landscape.

Higher education in general, and community colleges in particular, are expanding their missions and broadening their reach to adapt to the changing landscape of higher education. *Creating More Learning-Centered Community Colleges* tells us of a revolution that *will fundamentally change the education enterprise.* The trend in higher education is to provide information access anytime, anyplace, anywhere. PeopleSoft's applications are designed to deliver comprehensive, flexible, and integrated solutions for the community college enterprise to effectively and efficiently manage all aspects of administration, finance, human resources, student services, advancement, and grants. The innovative, integrated software enables colleges to deliver the right information to the right people, in the right format, at the right time–whether to students, faculty, or staff, on campus or online.

PeopleSoft for Higher Education is a dedicated business unit committed to understanding the needs of colleges and universities. The rapidly growing team employs individuals with backgrounds in higher education to ensure continued understanding of the diverse needs of the industry. The team includes a sales and marketing team and a Professional Services Organization for training, implementation, and support services; as well as strategists and development professionals to address the future needs of higher education–known and unknown.

PeopleSoft's current product offerings include PeopleSoft Financial for Public Sector, PeopleSoft HRMS for Public Sector, and PeopleSoft Student Administration. PeopleSoft Financial and HRMS for Public Sector are tailored to meet the unique financial management needs and regulatory guidelines specific to public sector organizations such as colleges and universities. PeopleSoft Student Administration provides a comprehensive set of six tightly integrated applications for Campus Community, Student Records, Academic Advisement, Financial Aid, Admissions and Recruitment, and Student Financial.

For more information, contact:
Laura King
Manager of Marketing Communications
PeopleSoft, Inc.
6903 Rockledge Drive, Eleventh Floor
Bethesda, MD 20817
Tel: (301) 571-5930
Fax: (301) 571-5880
E-mail: laura_king@peoplesoft.com
Web page: http://www.peoplesoft.com

http://www.league.org

26522 La Alameda, Suite 370
Mission Viejo, CA 92691
Tel (714) 367-2884
Fax (714) 367-2885